

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
GREENVILLE DIVISION

Demetrius Glenn,)	Case No. 6:22-cv-01320-DCC
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	ORDER
)	
)	
Adam Sinclair Ruffin, Michael)	
Henthorne, Ms. Williams, Ms. Megitt,)	
Ms. Barber, Ms. Mrs. Brown,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	

This matter is before the Court upon Plaintiff's motion for temporary restraining order ("TRO"). ECF No. 17. In accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and Local Civil Rule 73.02(B)(2) (D.S.C.), this matter was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Kevin F. McDonald for pre-trial proceedings and a Report and Recommendation ("Report"). On June 24, 2022, the Magistrate Judge issued a Report recommending the motion for TRO be denied. ECF No. 21. The Magistrate Judge advised Plaintiff of the procedures and requirements for filing objections to the Report and the serious consequences if he failed to do so. Plaintiff has not filed objections to the Report and the time to do so has lapsed.¹

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility to make a final

¹ Since the filing of the Report, Plaintiff has submitted a response to a special interrogatory. ECF No. 27. The Court has reviewed this document and it cannot be construed as objections to the Report.

determination remains with the Court. *See Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of any portion of the Report of the Magistrate Judge to which a specific objection is made. The Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter to the Magistrate Judge with instructions. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The Court will review the Report only for clear error in the absence of an objection. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (stating that “in the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a *de novo* review, but instead must only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” (citation omitted)).

After considering the record in this case, the applicable law, and the Report of the Magistrate Judge, the Court finds no clear error and agrees with the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge. The motion for TRO [17] is **DENIED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/ Donald C. Coggins, Jr.
United States District Judge

August 30, 2022
Spartanburg, South Carolina